EXHIBIT 4

1

1 THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA 3 EASTERN DIVISION 4 LORI ANN MORRIS, 5 Plaintiff, 6 Vs. CIVIL ACTION NO. 7 3:02-CV-962-T 8 FLORIDA TRANSFORMER, EDWARD NEAL THOMPSON, et al. 9 Defendants. 10 11 12 13 EXCERPT OF THE DEPOSITION OF EDWARD L. ROBINSON, 14 taken pursuant to stipulation and agreement 15 before Haley A. Phillips, Certified Shorthand 16 Reporter and Commissioner for the State of Alabama at 17 Large, in the Law Offices of Henry Penick, 18 Birmingham, Alabama, on Thursday, June 22, 2006, 19 2002, commencing at approximately 10:05 a.m. 20 21 * * * * * * * * * * * * 22 23 2 1 **APPEARANCES** 2 3 FOR THE PLAINTIFF: Henry Penick, Esq. Attorney at Law Birmingham, Alabama

4

		_		
Page	3	of	9	

6	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	
7	W. Evans Brittain, Esq.	
8	Richard Broughton, Esq. Ball, Ball, Matthews & Novak	
9	2001 Interstate Park Drive Montgomery, Alabama	
10		
11		
12		*
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
		2
	CELT DIA TELLON	3
1	STIPULATION	
2	It is hereby stipulated and agreed by and	
3	between counsel representing the parties that the	
4	deposition of EDWARD L. ROBINSON is taken pursuant	
5	to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and that	
6	said deposition may be taken before Haley A.	
7	Phillips, Certified Shorthand Reporter and	
8	Commissioner for the State of Alabama at Large,	
9	without the formality of a commission, that	0
LO	objections to questions other than objections as to	6

11	the form of the question need not be made at this
12	time but may be reserved for a ruling at such time
13	as the said deposition may be offered in evidence
14	or used for any other purpose by either party
15	provided for by the Statute.
16	It is further stipulated and agreed by and
17	between counsel representing the parties in this
18	case that the filing of said deposition is hereby
19	waived and may be introduced at the trial of this
20	case or used in any other manner by either party
21	hereto provided for by the Statute regardless of
22	the waiving of the filing of the same.
23	It is further stipulated and agreed by and
П	
	between the marking bounts and the mitter of the the
1	between the parties hereto and the witness that the
2	signature of the witness to this deposition is
3	hereby waived.
4	* * * * * * * * * * *
5	EDWARD L. ROBINSON
6	The witness, after having first been duly sworn to
7	speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but
8	the truth testified as follows:
9 10	
11	
12	
13	
14	

16

			(4 (6)	1	
1	Q.	Was there anything that you read in the			
2		affidavit that you took exception to, in			
3		either Mr. Thompson's or Mr. Tidwell's			
4		affidavits?			
5		MR. PENICK: Let me object to the			
6		form of the question until			
7		he's shown the affidavits. He			
8		doesn't have a photographic			
9		memory to remember everything			
10		that they said in their			
11		affidavits.			
12	Q.	Do you remember anything that you took			
13		exception to?			
14		You read them yesterday?			
15	A.	Yeah. No, I don't remember anything that I			
16		think is misstated or wrong. There may or			
17		may not be. He could have been going more			
18		than 70. He could have been going 65. But			
19		I think Mr. Thompson himself said that he			
20		was outrunning his lights, because he said			
21		I couldn't see the truck in time to stop.			
22		And if you're driving too fast for the			
23		range of your lights, regardless of what's			
				2	
1		in the road, you're outrunning your lights.		4	
2	Q.	Are you an			
	9.57				

3 A. He made that statement.

Q. Are you on expert on the range of

headlights from a Peterbilt?

- 6 A. No.
- 7 Have you done any investigation, research Q.
- in this case to determine the range of the 8
- 9 headlights on the Peterbilt?
- No. But he said he was outrunning them. 10 A.
- 11 0. Where in his affidavit did he say -- You're
- 12 talking about his statement that he could
- 13 not see the truck in time to avoid the
- collision. You've interpreted that to mean 14
- 15 he's saying he was, quote, outrunning his
- 16 lights?
- 17 A. Right.
- Have you done -- In this case, have you 18 0.
- 19 done any work to determine at what distance
- 20 away from the Kenworth vehicle that vehicle
- 21 would have been visible to an oncoming
- 22 driver of --
- 23 A. No.

- 1 0. -- a Peterbilt truck?
- 2 Α. No, not -- not for a driver of a Peterbilt
- 3 nor for this specific overturned truck
- 4 case.
- 5 Q. It's your opinion -- Is it your opinion
- 6 today that any person who fails to avoid
- 7 hitting an object in the highway at night
- is outrunning their lights? 8
- 9 A. For a stationary object in the highway in
- 10 front of them, yes, I would say they are.

3

11	Q.	Is	there	anybody	else	that	shares	that
12		op	Lnion?					

- 13 A. Not based on the way they drive. But the
- 14 statements in the literature, Paul Olson's
- 15 book, for example, the Alabama statute all
- 16 say that you have your vehicle under
- 17 control so that you can avoid or stop for
- 18 objects within the range of your lights.
- 19 Q. Have you ever testified in any other cases
- 20 to the contrary?
- 21 A. I don't recall. I know that we talked
- 22 earlier about a truck case with a man who
- 23 was wearing dark clothing. But he stepped

out in front of the truck as I recall, so

- 2 it wasn't a matter of something that was in
- 3 the road and there as a stationary object.
- 4 Q. Are you aware of any studies or tests done
- 5 by anyone with facts similar to this case
- 6 to determine the perception/reaction and
- 7 avoidability of an accident of this type?
- 8 A. I'm not familiar with specific pieces of
- 9 data in the literature. I'm sure that
- 10 Muttart's Drive 3 has some data with some
- 11 similarity to this. Since there are
- 12 hundreds of data points in his research, if
- 13 not thousands -- I think it's in the
- 14 thousands. No, I don't -- I don't know
- 15 that somebody has put an upside down truck
- or an overturned truck on a test strip and

17		tried to look for perception and reaction	
18		on an overturned truck.	
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
000			
		5	
1		EXAMINATION	
2	BY M	MR. PENICK:	
3	Q.	Doctor, I have one question. Do you have	
4		an opinion based upon reasonable a	
5		reasonable degree of accident	
6		reconstruction certainty whether Edward	
7		Thompson, the driver of the Peterbilt,	
8		could have avoided this accident?	
9		MR. BROUGHTON: Object to the	
10		form.	
11	A.	Yes.	
12	Q.	What is that opinion?	
13	Α.	Since that if he is, in fact, braking and	
14		slowing down as he approaches the Morris	
15		truck I can't keep them separate. But	
16		as he approaches the Morris truck, there	
17		was an emergency lane and space beyond that	
18		that he could have steered onto. And I	
19		think that the light pattern indication is	
20		not an accurate representation where the	,
21		tractor was located after the overturn and	

Case 3:05-cv-00962-MHT-SRW	Document 36-5	Filed 06/24/200

22		that he could have gone around the Morris	54.5	
23		vehicle.		
				6
1	Q.	Okay. What is the significance of absence		
2		of skid marks in this case?		
3	A.	That he either had defective brakes or that		
4		he didn't get on the brakes until very		*
5		shortly before the impact. In other words,		
6		he hadn't had his brakes on long enough to		
7		cause the wheels to stop rotating and heat		
8		up the contact with the pavement and leave		
9		marks.		
10		MR. PENICK: That's all at this		
11		time.		
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
]				